

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶1

Claims 1-6, 34-42 and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

The limitation of “comprising a product key” has been deleted in those claims. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶2

Claims 1-6, 34-42 and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

As described above, the limitation of “comprising a product key” has been deleted in those claims. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 34-36, 38-42 and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Huges.

Amended claim 1 positively recites, “wherein the identification includes information associated with the previously purchased product, a customer of the previously purchased product and the electronic device.” In claim 1, the electronic device requests the product identification code with a request including an identification, which includes information associated with the previously purchased product, the customer of the previously purchased product and the electronic device. And the product identification code is then found according to the information included in the identification.

Hughes does teach a “license file” which is a hash value of a concatenated product ID and hardware ID (¶ [0040]). However, nowhere in Hughes’s disclosure explicitly or implicitly imply that the hash value is associated with the previously purchased product, the customer of the previously purchased product and the electronic device, and therefore the hash value cannot be found and retrieved accordingly.

In addition, the claimed subject matter and the Hughes publication address different problems in their respective technical fields. The claimed subject matter addresses problems associated with a customer having to know and keep track of product identification codes to install/reinstall software products. In the claimed subject matter, a customer need not know the product identification code because it is retrieved and delivered to his electronic device. Conversely, in Hughes, the customer must enter the CD key and, therefore, must know at least a portion of the product ID. Hughes, meanwhile, addresses piracy problems by comparing the license file (i.e., the hash value) to a test ID calculated by the software product ([0040]-[0041]). By comparing the license file to the test ID, Hughes prevents the reinstallation of the software product on multiple machines.

In view of the differences between the cited Hughes reference and the subject matter of claim 1, applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable over Hughes. Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 34-36, and 38-42 depend from claim 1. Claim 44 is allowable for reasons analogous to those discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 4 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hughes in view of Flickinger. Claims 4 and 37 depend from claim 1, which is discussed above. Applicants submit that the deficiencies of Hughes with respect to claim 1 are not corrected by the addition of Flickinger.

Claim 44 was alternately rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hughes in view of Stanfield. The deficiencies of Hughes are not corrected by the addition of Stanfield. Therefore, claim 44 is allowable over the combination of Hughes and Stanfield.

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 34-36, 38-42, and 44 were alternately rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hughes in view of Official Notice. The deficiencies of Hughes are not corrected by the addition of Official Notice. Therefore, claims 1-3, 5, 6, 34-36, 38-42, and 44 are allowable over the combination of Hughes and Official Notice.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the

application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 24, 2010

/Guanyao Cheng/
Guanyao Cheng, Reg. No. 58555

SHIMOKAJI & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
8911 Research Drive
Irvine, CA 92618